Case 2:23-cv-00011-SAB ECF No. 27 filed 10/12/23 PageID.217 Page 1 of 3

FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Oct 12, 2023

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

No. 2:23-cv-00011-SAB

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS** 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT JESSE HILL,

Plaintiff,

v.

6

8

9

11

12

13

14 MARIANNE NICHOLS, KAREN

15 MARTIN, VICKY M. DALTON, LORI

16 LARSEN, SANDY JAMISON, DIANNA

17 GALVAN, CARI HALL, GARTH FELL,

18 PAUL ANDREWS, JULIE LUCILLE

19 ELDRED BONSTEEL ANDERSON, and

20 LINDA FARMER,

Defendants. 21

22

23

Before the Court are Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of the Order dismissing his First Amended Complaint, ECF No. 21, his Affidavit in support of that Motion, ECF No. 22, a Motion for Continuance, ECF No. 23, a "Motion for 26 Order Denominating the Proceeding Title in the Caption," ECF No. 24, his Objections to the Order dismissing his First Amended Complaint, ECF No. 25, and 28 his Declaration concerning his efforts to mail documents to Defendants. ECF No.

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS** # 1

26. The Motions were considered without oral argument on the date signed below.

By Order filed August 29, 2023, the Court Dismissed Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b). ECF No. 17. The Court entered judgment the same day. ECF No. 18. The Court found that Plaintiff's assertions 6 that various County Auditors did not permit him, an incarcerated felon, to sit on various Voters' Pamphlet Ballot Committees prior to various Washington State elections, was frivolous and did not state a claim upon which relief may be granted. ECF No. 17 at 2–3. Plaintiff, a prisoner at the Washington State 10 Penitentiary, is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. The Court did not direct that Defendants be served in this action.

## MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Courts may review a motion for reconsideration under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) (motion to alter or amend a judgment) or Rule 60(b) (relief from judgment). Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 16 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). "A district court may properly reconsider its decision if 17 it '(1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." Smith v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Dist., 727 F.3d 950, 955 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting School Dist. No. 1J Multnomah Cnty., Or., 5 F.3d at 1263). "There may also be other, highly unusual, circumstances warranting reconsideration." School Dist. No. 1J Multnomah Cnty., Or., 5 F.3d at 1263.

Having liberally construed Plaintiff's submissions, the Court finds that he 24 has presented no new facts, information, or newly discovered evidence for the Court to consider in evaluating his request. *Id.* His recitation of events occurring 26 after he submitted his First Amended Complaint on August 22, 2023, ECF No. 13, his efforts to run for elected office, ECF No. 21, and his "Objections," ECF No. 25, do not warrant reconsideration. Plaintiff has not shown that the Court committed

12

13

23

clear error or that the Court's Order Dismissing First Amended Complaint, ECF No. 17, was manifestly unjust. And there has been no intervening change in controlling law or any other circumstances warranting reconsideration. *School Dist. No. 1J Multnomah Cnty., Or.*, 5 F.3d at 1263.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 21, is DENIED.
- 2. All other pending Motions, **ECF Nos. 23 and 24,** are **DENIED as moot.** 
  - 3. The file shall remain **CLOSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter this Order, provide a copy to Plaintiff. The Court certifies any appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.

**DATED** this 12th day of October 2023.



Stanley A. Bastian Chief United States District Judge